



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,899	09/07/2006	Masanori Somei	1254-0323PUS1	7982
2292	7590	06/11/2009	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				PAGONAKIS, ANNA
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
				1614
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
06/11/2009			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/591,899	SOMEI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANNA PAGONAKIS	1614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 4-15 is/are pending in the application.

 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 4,5 and 13-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendment filed 2/28/2009 has been received and entered into the present application.

Claims 4-12 are pending. Accordingly, claims 6-12 remain withdrawn, claim 4 is newly amended and claims 13-15 are newly added.

Applicant's arguments, filed 2/28/2009 have been fully considered. Rejections not reiterated from previous Office Actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set of rejections presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 4-5 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Present claim 1 is directed to a compound represented by formula (I').

Applicant has not provided guidance as to where the newly added negative limitations are found in the instant application. Upon review of the disclosure, the negative limitations have not been found. Such disclosure of a negative limitation, wherein a compound of formula (I') is excluded where X represents a halogen, R² represents a cyclopropyl and X and R⁵ represent a halogen, fails to provide adequate written support. This is a clear broadening of the subject matter both claimed and disclosed in

the specification and claims as originally filed that is not adequately supported, either explicitly or implicitly, by the original disclosure because the original disclosure fails to provide adequate written support of the negative limitation, wherein a compound of formula (I') is excluded where X represents a halogen, R² represents a cyclopropyl and X and R⁵ represent a halogen. This amendment constitutes new matter. The MPEP states “[a]ny negative limitation or exclusionary proviso must have basis in the original disclosure. If alternative elements are positively recited in the specification they maybe explicitly excluded in the claims. See In re Johnson, 558 F.2d 1008, 1019, 194 USPQ 187, 196 (CCPA 1977). Any claim containing a negative limitation which does not have basis in the original disclosure should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.” See MPEP 2173.05(i).

MPEP 2163 states, “The courts have described the essential question to be addressed in a description requirement issue in a variety of ways. An objective standard for determining compliance with the written description is, "does the description clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that he or she invented what is claimed." In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Under Vas-Cath, Inc., v. Mahurkar, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir. 1991), to satisfy the written description requirement, an applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention, and that the invention, in that context, is whatever is now claimed. The test of sufficiency of support in a parent application is whether the disclosure of the application relied upon "reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at the time of the later claimed subject matter." Ralston Purina Co v. Far-Mar-Co., Inc., 772 F.2d 1366, 1375, 217 USPQ 1089, 1096, (Fed. Cir. 1983))... Whenever the issue arises, the fundamental factual inquiry is whether the specification conveys with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, applicant was in

possession of the invention as now claimed. See, e.g., Vas-Cath, Inc., v. Mahurkar, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir. 1991)."

Accordingly, the claims are considered to lack sufficient written description and are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4-5 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 recites the limitation wherein R1 represents a hydrogen atom in line 2. Further, in claim 4 the limitation excluding R1 from representing a hydrogen atom is recited (three lines from bottom of page 1). Claim 4 recites the limitation wherein R3, R5 and R6 each represent a hydrogen atom, line 7, however, claim 4 also recites the exclusion of hydrogen as substituents of R3, R5 and R6 (three lines from bottom of page 1). Claim 4 recites the limitation wherein R4 is a substituted or unsubstituted C1-6 alkyl, however, claim 4 also recites the exclusion of methyl as a substituent of R4 (two lines from bottom of page 1), it is noted that a C1 alkyl is a methyl group. Claim 4 recites the limitation wherein R2 is a substituted or unsubstituted C1-6 alkyl, however, claim 4 also recites the exclusion of methyl as a substituent of R2 (line three of page 3), it is noted that a C1 alkyl is a methyl group. Newly added claim 13 recites the limitation wherein X is a halogen, however, claim 4 recites the exclusion of X as a halogen. Newly added claim 14 recites the limitation wherein R3 is a bromine atom, however, claim 4 recites the exclusion of R3 as a bromine atom. Given the claim language, it is unclear which substituents are included and which are excluded from the claim. Reconsideration of the claims, specifically which substituents of the core structure is either included or excluded, is requested.

Conclusion

No claim is found to be allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANNA PAGONAKIS whose telephone number is (571)270-3505. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday, 9am to 5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin H. Marschel can be reached on 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AP

/Patricia A. Duffy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1645